RG104 E-1 Box 151

Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.,

SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE.

April 24, 1888.

Sir:

With reference to the matter submitted by Mr. Joseph D. Barton — namely — whether it would be legal and proper for a party to issue, as commemorative tokens, bronze pieces of the same dimensions as the 1¢ piece, with the obverse design of that token, to wit the Indian head — the reverse to bear a legend suitable to the purpose for which it would be issued — I have the honor to say that such an imitation of a United States coin would be neither legal nor tolerable. The bronze cent is only a token, and hence the proposed issue would bear two similitudes of the cent — the obverse design, and the quality of the piece — both counting as "tokens". The 61st section of the Coinage Law of 1873, seems to cover the case.

Very Respectfully

Hon. David M. Fox
Superintendent

NARA RG104, Entry 1, Box 151

Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.,
Superintendent's Office,
April 24, 1888

Sir:

With reference to the matter submitted by Mr. Joseph Wharton – namely – whether it would be legal and proper for a party to issue, as commemorative tokens, bronze pieces of the same dimensions as the 1¢ piece, with the obverse designs of that token, to wit – the Indian head – the reverse to bear a legend suitable to the purpose for which it would be issued – I have the honor to say that such an imitation of a United States coin would be neither legal nor tolerable. The bronze cent is only a token, and hence the proposed issued would bear two similitudes of the cent – the obverse design, and the quality of the piece – both ranking as "tokens". The 61st section of the coinage law of 1873 seems to cover the case.

Very Respectfully,
M.H. Cobb
Cash.

Hon. Danl. M. Fox
Superintendent